

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.6.3
Eastern Division**

Willie Wilson, et al.

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 1:22-cv-04577
Honorable Joan H.
Lefkow

City of Chicago Board of Election Commissioners,
et al.

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Wednesday, November 2, 2022:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Joan H. Lefkow: The motion by Plaintiffs Willie Wilson et al. for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction [19] is denied. This case challenges the consolidation of voting precincts by the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners (CBEC) and its commissioners, an action which allegedly violates the civil rights of plaintiffs and certain racial and ethnic groups of voters and violates Illinois election law. (Dkt. 1 at 512.) This case was filed on August 29, 2022. Although the complaint seeks declaratory and injunctive relief and plaintiffs were aware that the mid-term election was set to occur on November 8, 2022, plaintiffs made no attempt to obtain preliminary relief until nearly two months later when Wilson filed a pro se motion. This court struck that motion because Wilson was represented by counsel. Plaintiffs subsequently filed their first proper motion for preliminary relief on November 1, exactly one week before the election, and the court has been notified by the courtroom deputy that they have requested a motion hearing on November 4. With a week remaining until the election, plaintiffs ask this court to order the defendants to "open, maintain, staff, and allow in-person voting at all precincts and voting locations that were maintained and operated at the June 2022 primary election in Chicago" and to notify the public on the CBEC website prior to the upcoming election (dkt. [19] at 3). Plaintiffs characterize their motion as an "emergency" motion, but it is an emergency of their own making. The relief they request would obviously be impracticable, if not impossible, to accomplish at this late date. There is no apparent reason why the motion could not have been brought on a timely basis. It is therefore denied. The court notes that the defendants, via their motion to dismiss, have also challenged the sufficiency of the plaintiffs' injury to support standing. The court reserves ruling on this issue because it is not yet fully briefed. Mailed notice (ags)

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at www.ilnd.uscourts.gov.